



Response to a first Office Action

Application No. 10/733,967

This communication is a response to a first Office Action having a mailing date of 03/23/2005 and setting forth a shortened statutory period for response which expired on 06/23/2005. The applicant will file a petition for a one month extension of time together with the appropriate fee. Therefore, this response will expire on 07/23/2005.

Remarks

Claims 1 - 8 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent No. 2,580,625. to Waltz.

The examiner refers to Waltz with regard to claim 1 as "disclosing a multiple fishing rod retention system comprising at least two blocks --at 40 and 60-- spaced from each other". The Waltz reference does not shown any blocks 40 and 60. The alleged block 40 is described by Waltz as being a hook or a socket.. The examiner cannot rename the described items in a reference to suit the language of the claims. Therefore, the hook 40 of waltz clearly is not a block. the element 60 of Waltz is described as a bracket which clearly is not a block. The examiner continues to state that "each of the blocks have bores therethrough for receiving ends of fishing rods, see proximate 40 in Fig. 2". The proximate? 40 is not a bore at all, it is simply a bent hook that does not qualify as a Block. It is agreed that once a fishing hook is placed within the hook 40, there is a means for clamping the fishing rod therein. However the claimed structure in claim 1 is totally different from that shown by Waltz, as explained above.

The examiner makes reference to claim 2 that "Waltz discloses the means for clamping includes a clamping block 60 or at 40, the clamping block is movable relative to each of the retention blocks to obstruct the bore to trap the fishing rod